

Addendum / Corrigendum

Part-A

1. While the study has been completed in 2010, why is it that it covers data till 2003-04 (p:3).

Clarification: Actually the research started in 2005 and at that point of time the data available was up to 2003. During the course of our study, we include data of the year 2005, when those were published. The research was done with the data up to 2005 and not with the data up to 2003-04 as mentioned by the examiner (page 84, section 4.3.2).

2. While plan-wise fish production data are furnished (table 1.3), is it possible to furnish plan-wise expenditure data on fish production as well? (p: 4)

Clarification: Since the profit (or revenue) function in no way related with the objective of the study, we did not require expenditure data or price of catch. However, plan-wise macro-aggregate expenditure data on fish production are neither meaningful nor estimated by any agency.

3. What is the unit used to measure GDP, Share of agriculture in GDP and share of fisheries in GDP in Appendix-I?

Clarification:. The unit of GDP is Rs. in '₹ Crore'.

4. How the growth rate of fisheries for 1970-71 is calculated as the data for the previous year is not shown in the Appendix-I?

Clarification: The growth rate was calculated using the data published by RBI. We have calculated the growth rate of fishery in any year 't' following the normal procedure as follows:

$$\frac{\text{fishery contribution in } GDP_{t+1} - \text{fishery contribution in } GDP_t}{\text{fishery contribution in } GDP_t} \times 100$$

This is why a value of (t-1)th period does not appear in fishery column in appendix-1.

1. It would have enrich the study further had the scholar provided an explanation as to why since economic reforms the share of fisheries in GDP has been persistently increasing?

Clarification: The detail analysis of impact of economic reforms on fishery contribution in GDP is beyond the scope of this study. However, we have referred the point of fishery contribution in GDP only to the extent it is relevant to efficiency measurement of Indian Marine Fishing Fleet.

2. To arrange the sequence of the hypotheses in correspondence with the objectives.

We have noted down the observation.

Part-B

1. Analysis of fish production data only indicates the trend of change but does not provide any explanation behind these changes.

Clarification: Possibly the examiner overlooked the brief discussion on possible explanation like, vessels suffering from scale efficiency, over crowding of vessels, depletion of biomass stock etc. (section 'Problem of the study'). However, this is the introductory chapter and the name of the chapter itself suggests that it only gives the overview of Indian marine fishery and detailed explanation of declining fish production was beyond the scope of the study of that chapter. The chapter was supposed to introduce the basic facts of Indian marine fishery as a whole.

2. It would have been better had the scholar cited some references which have established the causality among low fish catch, juvenile catches, destructive fishing gears, pollution, etc. (p: 48).

Clarification: Juvenile catches, destructive fishing gears, pollution cause low fish catch is obvious. Causality does not require to establish. Marine Fishing Policy (2004), GOI; FAO's Code of Conduct of Responsible Fisheries; Coastal Aquaculture Act (2005) GOI. etc are based on this accepted causality principle. BOBP-IGO, of which India is a member, is established to protect biomass stock by preventing juvenile catches, destructive fishing gears and pollution. All these are referred in pages – 48 & 49 in the thesis.

3. Sweeping observations have been made under the phraseology "Many expert suggested" (p:49), "many studies observe" (p:50), "It is already reported by different studies" (p:50) without citing the references/studies etc. It will be nice if some references are cited against such claims.

Clarification: These features of Indian Marine Fisheries are well accepted by govt. agencies, planners and policy makers. However, references in this regard are included in bibliography, particularly.

- a) *Status of Indian Marine Fisheries Development: An Appraisal*, Fishing Chimes, 2003
- b) *Factoring Social and Cultural Dimensions into Food and Livelihood security Issues of Marine Fisheries: A Case Study of Kerala State*, India. Working Paper 299, Centre for Development Studies. Thiruvananthapuram, India Kurien, J. 2000

Part-C

1. While assessing the contribution of fisheries in national GDP (p: 74, para 1), a comparative picture citing the contribution of the same in other countries having a comparable coastline would have made the problem under study better pinpointed.

Clarification: Biomass stock and species available in a particular marine zone depends on salinity, temperature of water, direction of flow of water, availability of inorganic nutrients in that zone etc and not on coastline. Marine fishery production depends on available biomass stock. Thus coast line becomes dependent variable of production and comparable only when it lies in same marine

climatic zone. Countries with comparable coastlines may not be having similar EEZ or fishery potential or other criteria similar to that of India. Thus we do not consider that it would have been more pin-pointed if comparison is made between different countries located in different marine climatic zone.

2. It is assumed that DMUs have a built-in auto correct mechanism so that they can take corrective measures in 2005 based on their performances in 2003. As much of the fishing activities are undertaken by the private operators, what is the rationale of such assumption?

Clarification: The examiner has mentioned about the built-in auto corrective mechanism in Indian marine fishery. The built-in auto corrective mechanism in Indian marine fishery is the economic survival and sustainability of each and individual boats. If the numbers of boats are less than the optimum then all the boats start to make more profits and thus more boats join the fishery. In the next year profit share diminishes and those who have less profit or no profit may not survive in the future. Thus those boats who have economically survived remain and those did not leave the scene. Obviously economics have own built-in auto corrective mechanism.

“Part-D”

1. The researcher might explicitly state as to how average time spent in fishing by each type of fishermen has been calculated (p: 106, para: 2).

Clarification: A fishermen is defined as part-time if he spends minimum 30 percent to maximum 90 percent of his time in fishing. A fisherman is defined as occasional if he spends minimum 10 percent to 30 percent of his time in fishing. The average time spend has been used as the weight while calculating the effective fishermen index. That is why 0.6 is the effective weight of part-time fishermen and 0.2 is the effective weight of occasional fishermen

2. While constructing the index for effective fishermen, the researcher has assumed a linear relationship which needs to be justified.

Clarification: Given the gears, nets, mesh size, biomass stock etc, the harvest is always directly proportional to time spent. Hence, a linear relationship is used.


DR. AJIT KUMAR RAY
Professor
Dept. of Commerce
University of North Bengal


12/2/2012

